



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—HORACE AND TIBULLUS.

I. CARM. I. 33 AND EPIST. I. 4.

Albi, ne doleas plus nimio memor
immitis Glyceræ, neu miserabiles
decantes elegos, cur tibi iunior
laesa præniteat fide.

Albi, nostrorum sermonum candide iudex,
quid nunc te dicam facere in regione Pedana?
Scribere quod Cassi Parmensis opuscula vincat,
An tacitum silvas inter reptare salubris,
curantem quicquid dignum sapiente bonoque est?
Non tu corpus eras sine pectore: di tibi formam,
di tibi divitias dederunt artemque fruendi.
Quid voveat dulci nutricula maius alumno,
qui sapere et fari possit quæ sentiat, et cui
gratia, fama, valetudo contingat abunde,
et mundus victus non deficiente crumena?
Inter spem curamque, timores inter et iras
omnem crede diem tibi diluxisse supremum:
grata superveniet quæ non sperabitur hora.
Me pinguem et nitidum bene curata cute vises,
cum ridere voles, Epicuri de grege porcum.

Horace addresses two of his poems, Odes I. 33 and Epistles I. 4, to a certain Albius, who is generally identified with the well-known elegiac poet, Tibullus. But over a generation ago this identification was challenged by Baehrens,¹ whose views were combated with more or less success by some scholars, but for the most part merely ignored.² They found, however, a very clever defender some years ago in the person of J. P. Postgate, the well-known English scholar.³ So far as I know, Postgate's presenta-

¹ Emil Baehrens, *Tibullische Blätter*, 1876, p. 7 ff. Baehrens' idea is not new; Cruquius rejected the identification on the assumption that Tibullus was born in 43 B. C. (the year of the birth of Lygdamus who, in Cruquius' time, was supposed to be Tibullus) and thus could not have been a critic of Horace's Satires (Epist. I. 4. 1).

² See, however, Sellar, *Horace and the Elegiac Poets*, 1892, p. 225 f.

³ *Selections from Tibullus*, 1903, p. 179.

tion of the facts as he saw them has never been answered. His arguments are very plausible, and therefore worth answering, but I should not attempt to do so if it were not necessary in order to clear the way for a detailed and partially new interpretation of the epistle that Horace addressed to Albius.

Postgate attempts to explain away all of the evidence that Albius was the *nomen* of the poet Tibullus. Such a course is made possible by the fact that no evidence for the *nomen* is furnished either by Tibullus or contemporary writers. The main sources are Porphyrio and Diomedes of the third or fourth century and a biography of Tibullus found in the Tibullian MSS.¹ This biography has been thought to be an abridgment of the one which Suetonius probably wrote in his "De Viris Illustribus". For the sake of the argument Postgate admits that Suetonius is the ultimate source of this life, and this surprising generosity rather takes one off one's guard. But his generosity is not altruistic. He argues that Suetonius may have known no more about Tibullus than we do; that in fact no more material for a biography may have existed in his day than at present. Surely this is going to extremes; judging from the Lives of Suetonius that are extant, he did have a considerable amount of material at hand which is not accessible to us. If historians were to use Postgate's method our histories would be very much attenuated. He arranges his argument very ingeniously: "I grant you", he implies, "that the Vita goes back to Suetonius, and since Suetonius lived so much earlier than Diomedes and Porphyrio, we can ignore the latter two; but there is nothing in the Vita which anybody at all could not find out from the extant poems of Tibullus and Horace themselves, or from an extant four line epitaph of Tibullus! Therefore", runs his argument, "Suetonius used only these sources, invented the identification of Albius with Tibullus, and thus there is no value in the evidence of the Vita—old as it is in origin—in favor of the *nomen* Albius for Tibullus". Surely we must protest against the ignoring of Diomedes and Porphyrio, and must ask why Suetonius should have identified

¹ In addition there are the MSS. of Tibullus (none earlier than the 14th century) and of Horace, with their titles. The Horatian titles, however, are believed to go back to Porphyrio's text (Vollmer, Philologus, Suppl. X, 1905, p. 315 n. 126). Porphyrio, Diomedes and the MSS. of Horace identify the Albius of Horace with the poet Tibullus.

Tibullus with Albius if they were as unlike as Postgate then sets out to show that they were.

The real arguments against the identification of Albius and Tibullus are internal. Horace says that Albius is blessed with material wealth; Tibullus constantly complains of being poor. But there is nothing inconsistent here; poverty and riches were relative terms then as now. Much of Tibullus' ancestral wealth had been lost, through no fault of his, as is apparent from his own words, and by contrast with the wealth of his fathers he felt himself poor.¹ Then, again, it was the proper thing for an elegiac poet to plead poverty. The statements indicative of poverty that seem least conventional are all in the first elegy of the first book—possibly showing that Tibullus' fortunes improved, perhaps with the help of Messalla.

Another point urged against the identification is the apparent comparison of Albius with an unimportant poet, Cassius Parmensis. Postgate sums up thus: "Would the author of the first book of the *Epistles* have publicly asked the poet of Delia and Nemesis if he was engaged upon something that would surpass the minor productions of this Cassius Parmensis? If so, he would have told the late poet laureate at the end of his life that he might write something to excel the minor productions of Mr. Andrew Lang". This point, such as it is, will be considered a little later.

The argument that has seemed strongest in favor of Baehrens' and Postgate's theory is that Horace, in *Carm. I. 33*, speaks of a Glycera as the beloved of Albius, though no such name is mentioned by Tibullus. Since everyone agrees that the Albius of the Ode is the same as the Albius of the *Epistle*, the battle has raged largely around this name. Some have held that Glycera is a pseudonym for Delia or Nemesis, the girls to whom many of Tibullus' elegies are addressed; by others, as Postgate puts it, "a third mistress and a third series of love elegies have to be invented and fitted in where best they can, and ill enough at that", while others, as Baehrens and Postgate, have denied the identification of Albius with Tibullus.² The second explana-

¹ See below, part II, p. 160.

² It is with some diffidence that I venture to express an opinion on this well-worn theme. For the lengthy literature see Cartault, *Apropos du Corpus Tibullianum*, 1906.

tion is that of the literal-minded, and such can never appreciate Horace. They maintain either that the book of Glycera elegies is entirely lost, or that nothing remains of it but the two supposedly Tibullian poems, IV, 13 and 14 of the *Corpus Tibullianum*, though the name Glycera is not found in them. If it is necessary to accept this theory, I fail to see how one can avoid accepting the companion-theory that the girl casually mentioned in the same Ode by the type-name Pholoe is one and the same as the Pholoe once mentioned by Tibullus. This theory, actually proposed in all seriousness by early scholars, is now of course considered absurd.

It seems to me that the true explanation is that Horace has Nemesis in mind when he uses the name Glycera. I should not insist, however, on the point that Glycerae is the metrical equivalent of Nemesis in Horace's line, though this may have been a factor. The probable date of the Ode (see below) makes for the identification with Nemesis rather than with Delia. Horace's words, too, apply better to Nemesis, judging from Tibullus' description.¹ No sufficient reasons have ever been given for Horace's use of the pseudonym Glycera. Postgate justly criticizes Sellar's explanation that the name is chosen for the sake of the oxymoron—a favorite Horatian figure. Rather, *immitis* is chosen to produce oxymoron with Glycera.

We must find the true explanation elsewhere. No name perhaps had a more definite connotation to a Greek or Roman than the name Glycera. It was one of the most common names of *hetaerae*, and Horace might just as well have used the common noun *meretrix*, except that it would be less refined and romantic. Horace himself uses the name a number of times for no particular individual, but for the class. Glycera is, therefore, hardly a proper noun at all. Its use corresponds to that of Gaia, commonly used as a synonym for *mulier*. Similar instances are common in all languages; cf. Jezebel (in French *Mégère*), Jehu, etc. Now the use of such a name by Horace gives a deeper meaning to the passage. It does not mean merely: "Albius, do not grieve overmuch when you think of the bitter-sweet Glycera", but has the added force: "for she is only a *meretrix* after all". Horace does not deign to honor Nemesis by calling her Nemesis.

¹ It is to be remembered throughout that it makes no difference for our purpose whether Tibullus' love adventures are real or not; Horace may be thinking of Tibullus as the elegiac poet or as the man.

Horace goes on to say: "Do not drone out your pitiful elegies just because she has broken her word and a younger man outshines you in her favor". Some difficulty has been found in reconciling this with the fact that Tibullus does not complain of a younger but of a richer rival. The explanation that Horace is inexact because exactness is not necessary is sufficient, but another may be suggested. *Iunior* may have been deliberately chosen instead of *ditior* as another humorous dig like the use of *Glycera*—for with women of that sort a young rival was not to be feared so much as an extravagant one, especially since Tibullus could scarcely have been much more than thirty years old at the time, and may have been considerably younger. The juxtaposition of *tibi* and *iunior* would heighten the point of the jest.¹

We now come to the 4th Epistle of the 1st book. In analyzing this poem we will see further objections to the theory that *Albius* and *Tibullus* are not the same. Our lack of knowledge concerning the circumstances has made this a difficult poem to interpret. It is necessary to approach it from the point of view of the student of *Tibullus* and yet consider it from the *Horatian* standpoint as well.² It was probably written between 23 and 20 B. C. Some editors have held that it was written before the *Odes* were published in 23, because they are not mentioned in verse 1 as having come under the critical eye of *Albius*, but there is no point to this argument at all, for by the same token it might be argued that it was written before the *Epodes* were published,

¹ In this Ode Horace is perhaps hinting to *Tibullus* to abandon elegiac poetry and to take up a form more suited to singing the praises and furthering the policy of *Augustus*. In the Ode immediately preceding, Horace calls upon his lyre to sing a "Latin" song, i. e., one concerning Roman affairs, and in *Carm. II. 9. 19* openly asks *Valgius* to write about *Augustus* (note the tactful use of the first person *cantemus*). See also below, on *Epist. I, 4* (p. 158, n. 1).

² A detailed interpretation of the poem was given by *Cartault* (*Horace et Tibulle, Rev. de phil. 30, 1906, p. 210*) which hardly does that student of *Tibullus* and *Horace* justice. He misses the spirit of the *Epistles* altogether, thinking that Horace is making fun of philosophy and tragedy and is urging *Tibullus* to go back to his gay life of woman and song at Rome. *Cartault* expresses the same ideas, somewhat modified and curtailed, in his edition of *Tibullus* (1909) p. 26 f. The interpretation, it seems to me, needs no refutation. I would merely call attention to the fact that the mention of the *nutricula* in vs. 8 is entirely out of harmony with *Cartault's* interpretation.

which is impossible.¹ Tibullus may have been one of the *compluris alios*—scholars and friends—whom Horace says, in the 10th Satire of the 1st book, that he purposely passes over, after mentioning by name the men whose approval he seeks.² It is worth noting that the term *candidus* is at various times applied by Horace to five of the men appearing in this list, Maecenas, Virgil, Plotius, Varius and Furnius,³ and that the only other time it occurs in the same sense it is used of Tibullus. It seems to be reserved by Horace for those who approved of the Satires. That Tibullus is not mentioned by name in the 10th Satire is not surprising; he must have been a very young man at the time. If this be accepted we must either put the date of Tibullus' birth as early as 54 or 55 (on the other hand, it could not have been much earlier; see below p. 164, n. 2), or else that of the Satire considerably later than 35, the commonly accepted date. The latter alternative seems impossible.

My conception of the situation at the time of the Epistle is this: Tibullus' love-affair with Nemesis was not turning out well, as we see from his poems; after the final break came, Horace comforted him with the Ode we have discussed (*memor* in verse 1 shows that it is all off). This may have been as late as 23 B. C., when the Odes were published. Matters went from bad to worse; Tibullus retires to the country, to the scenes of his childhood, to try to forget his unsweet sweetheart and his other troubles, but he cannot shake off his melancholy; his friends at Rome become alarmed, and Horace, one of the most tactful men that ever lived, writes to his young friend the Epistle before us, with the intention of cheering him and diverting his thoughts.⁴

¹ Neither the Odes nor the Epodes are mentioned because only the Satires had been attacked by the critics, and only they defended by Tibullus. See also below, p. 167, n. 1.

² For evidence in favor of this supposition, see below, part III, p. 164.

³ Epod. 14, 5; Serm. I. 5. 40-41, I. 10. 86.

⁴ This description is perhaps too romantic. I see no reason however for believing that Tibullus' love affairs were entirely fictitious, unromantic as they may have been. Indeed he would have been a strange Roman if they had been. It is true that Jacoby makes the extraordinary statement (Rhein. Mus. 65, 1910, p. 68) that Tibullus' poetry proves that he had no liaisons with women; that, in fact, he was not interested in erotic elegy but in bucolic poetry, and that he spoiled his poetry by dragging in erotic passages in order to satisfy the demands of the genus elegy. But why in the world did Tibullus pick out such a genus to work in? And why could he not adapt the

Horace establishes himself, so to speak, by calling to mind that he and Tibullus are connected by the bond of literary friendship—*candide iudex*; this gives Horace the right to speak about Tibullus' affairs. At the same time the phrase puts the two into the position of two friends on a par, and the words which follow will not seem like the admonitions of an older man, given only to be ignored. Horace achieves a similar result in the 8th epistle by admitting his own failings. The right to quiz Tibullus he assumes in verse 2, by asking him what he is doing—yet he does not ask it directly, bluntly, but with fine tact and delicacy—not "What are you doing now in the *regio Pedana*"? but, "What shall I say that you are doing now in the *regio Pedana*"? Horace suggests the answer himself: "Shall I say that you are writing, etc. (verse 3), or wandering, etc. (verses 4 and 5)"? Notice that the second suggestion receives two lines, and the first only one line. They are not two evenly matched suggestions, but the second is the one really meant, as is often the case with the second member of a double question connected by *an*. But what is the purpose and meaning of verse 3? This has been much discussed. Cassius Parmensis is an obscure poet, and it has been urged that it would be no great compliment to Tibullus to be compared to him, and that, therefore, Albius is not Tibullus; but I fail to see why the comparison would be any more complimentary to an Albius who was not Tibullus but a rich literary amateur—as Postgate puts it—at least from Albius' point of view.¹ In fact, the comparison would surely give offense to an amateur, while a real poet with an established reputation would

elegy to his own purposes? Jacoby does not sufficiently meet these objections. Nor do I agree with the analysis—keen and valuable as it often is in details—which leads him to these conclusions. To return to Tibullus, it is not unreasonable to suppose that he had some unpleasant experiences which increased an already existing tendency towards morbid introspection. A middle ground, something like that which Schanz takes (*Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* § 279.2), seems to me the safest in the dispute between those who accept every word that Tibullus says of himself and his sweethearts as historical fact, and those who hold that everything is convention. Furthermore, as far as we are at present concerned, it makes little difference, for Horace may have chosen in this Epistle, as in the Ode, to adopt the romantic, but fictitious, (if it is fictitious) attitude of Tibullus. This should be remembered throughout the following discussion.

¹ To be sure, Tibullus himself has been called a dilettante (Jacoby, in *Rhein. Mus.* 65, 1910, p. 72).

laugh at it. We know very little about Cassius Parmensis as a literary man. The Scholiasts seem to have drawn their information largely from the text of Horace. The word *opuscula* may be belittling, as it is in the only other place where it is used by Horace (Epist. I. 19. 35), in speaking of his own poems.¹ We need not infer from Horace's words that Cassius was a writer of elegies, especially not that he was a prominent writer of elegies; we can leave that to the literal-minded again. Horace is having a little joke at Tibullus' expense, though the joke has a purpose, to make Tibullus smile and to put him in a cheerful mood for the rest of the letter.

Do verses 4 and 5, then, represent what Horace thought Tibullus was doing? Was Tibullus a philosopher (i. e. a practical philosopher)—for that is what the *sapiens bonusque* was, cf. Epist. I. 7. 22, I. 16. 20, 73?² As there is nothing to indicate that he was, and much to indicate that he was not, some have thought that here, too, we have an argument against the Albius-Tibullus identification. But the true explanation is that Horace is here tactfully hinting to Tibullus that philosophy is his only cure.³ The hint is so delicate that it has escaped many editors, but a comparison with other Epistles makes this interpretation certain. After the first dedicatory Epistle, the second, third, fourth, and probably the fifth and sixth, are all letters to younger men. In all of them Horace manages to introduce the thought that the philosopher's life is the best. In several of the letters Horace tactfully meets a delicate situation; the seventh Epistle, in which he openly declares to Maecenas his independence and his intention to do exactly as he pleases, and yet gives no offense, is a good example; another is the third, where he settles a quarrel between two young men in masterly fashion. In the same letter he suggests to Florus, by means of a contrary-to-fact condition, that he become a philosopher: "If you only could abandon these cold-compresses of care you would be going where heavenly philosophy leads". These and the two following lines are the only ones in the whole Epistle of 36 lines in which Horace's philosophy of life—the dominant theme of the first book of the Epistles—is touched upon. Now is not that the way verses 4 and 5 of the

¹ See below, part IV, p. 166, where additional light on the interpretation of verses 1-3 is given.

² *Curo* also is technical, cf. Epist. I. 1. 11.

³ See also Kettner, *Die Episteln des Horaz*, *ad loc.*

fourth Epistle are to be taken? Horace means that it would be wise for Tibullus to turn philosopher; thus he could overcome his troubles. Verse 4 shows what is the matter with Tibullus; *tacitum* shows that he is brooding, melancholy; *reptare* suggests the dragging steps of a dejected individual; *salubris* cannot be an idle epithet, for that is not in Horace's style; it suggests that Tibullus was looking for *salubritas*—but *valetudo* in verse 10 shows that physical health is not meant. It must be mental health. Tibullus himself speaks of *salubribus herbis* (II. 3. 13) as an attempted cure for love, and the word is common in that sense.¹

Now we come to verse 6. Here the connection of thought is rather obscure, and, therefore, all the more important. Horace leaves it to us to fill in the gaps, and, because he so often does so, the Satires and Epistles are not always easy reading. "You are fully capable of becoming a philosopher", implies Horace, saying: "(for) you did not use to be a mere body without a mind and soul."² (It is true that) the gods gave you beauty and riches, (but they also) gave you the art of enjoying them properly". Unless we take verse 5 as a hint in the way I have suggested I can see no plausible connection between it and verse 6. Others have called attention to the contrast between the tense of *eras*, in verse 6, and the *nunc* of verse 2. *Nunc* contrasts also with verse 1, and the whole passage means that Tibullus was getting the greatest possible enjoyment out of life when he was a very young man, as Horace knew, but that he was interested in other things as well, such as literature, so much so that he passed judgment on Horace's Satires, not to mention writing verse himself. Verses 8–11 are an amplification of verses 5–7. But why is the nurse mentioned? The diminutive is evidently one of affection. From our point of view a reference to his mother would have been more in place, but the indispensable nurse played a very important part in Roman home life, as she still very often does in some European countries. "In Latin literature are many passages that testify to the affection felt for each other by nurse and child, an affection that lasted on into manhood and womanhood".³ The reason for the mention is obvious if our interpretation of the poem as a

¹ Pichon, de sermone amatorio apud lat. elegiarum scriptores, 1902, s. v.

² For the force of *eras*, see Wickham's note, though he misses the point in verses 4 and 5.

³ Johnston, The Private Life of the Romans, p. 71. Cf. e. g. Pers. 2. 39 and Sen. Ep. 60. 1.

whole is accepted. Just as in verse 5 Horace suggests philosophy to Tibullus as a means of dispelling his melancholy, so in verse 8 he strives for the same result by delicately calling to mind tender memories of his childhood days in a manner displaying wonderful tact and good taste, especially, if, as I believe to be the case, Tibullus is at the time living in the country home of his childhood, a home of which he never tires of speaking in his elegies.

In verse 9 *sapere* again hints at philosophy as a care dispeller: "One who has it *in his power* to be a philosopher and to put into words what he feels", with the implication that Tibullus is not making use of these powers. The second book of his elegies is unusually short, and may be incomplete, suggesting that he gave up his writing after his troubles (whether love troubles, or melancholia, or both) began.¹ Besides that, he has influential friends (*gratia*), a good name (*fama*), good physical health (*valetudo*), and a comfortable income. *Sapere* and *fari* are put first, as indicating the things that Horace considers of most importance, and are separated from the rest.

In verse 12 again the connection of thought is difficult and important. Verses 12-14 can mean nothing unless a consolation is intended, and the consolation must suit the poem as a whole. The four emotions in verse 12 are not chosen to typify "the ordinary experiences of life", as it has been put, but are meant to apply rather to Tibullus' state of mind.² These emotions are arranged in pairs, the separation of the pairs being indicated not merely by the use of *inter* with each, but also by the use of the singular in the first pair and the plural in the second. We are justified, therefore, in looking for a resemblance between the members of each pair. No other resemblance seems possible except that the first pair are pleasant feelings and the second unpleasant. Furthermore there seems to be a relation between the first and third, and the second and fourth words. Thus we can determine the meaning of *cura*, the only word whose meaning is doubtful. The only meaning that *cura* can have here, classed as it is with the pleasant word *spem*, is love. This is a common meaning in

¹ It looks as if Horace were trying to get Tibullus to follow the lead of himself and Virgil and become an exponent of the emperor's policy of improving the morals, etc., of the people. See above on Carm. I. 33 (p. 153, n. 1).

² For the emotions typifying the ordinary experiences of life, see the quotations from Horace and Virgil just below.

Catullus, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid. Especially interesting is its use in Epist. I. 3. 30, on which Kiessling's note is to the point, and in Tibullus II. 3. 13, the very line which was quoted above for the use of *salubribus herbis*. *Spem* and *timores* are akin in that they both look to the future.¹ So *curam* and *iras* are alike in dealing with the present. Of course this is the secondary balance; the primary one being between the pairs. Such balances are not uncommon, e. g. Epist. I. 6. 12: *Gaudeat an doleat, cupiat metuatne, quid ad rem?*² The first pair deals with the present; the second with the future. Besides, *gaudeat* and *cupiat* are contrasted with *doleat* and *metuat*, the pleasant with the unpleasant. In this example the primary balance is between the time-spheres; in the fourth Epistle between the pleasant and unpleasant.

The use of *spes*, referring to love, is common, and the word in this sense is often contrasted with *timor*.³ The idea of anger contrasted with love is seen in Carm. I. 16. 25 ff., in which Horace retracts his anger if love is allowed to take its place. In the elegiac poets *ira* is often the result of troubles in love.⁴ It should be noted that Horace is using throughout this line the technical language of elegy.

In the midst, then, of these feelings brought on by his love affair Tibullus should remember, says Horace, what a precious boon mere life is, and should count every added hour a special gift of heaven.

The last two lines are humorous, as is generally recognized. The tact of *vires* should be noted: "You will come to visit me"—but in effect it is a command, though tempered by the following clause. The future is used thus in Epist. I. 13. 2, 10, 12 and I. 17. 12. A similar effect of quiet authority is attained by a different device in Epist. I. 3. 36.

¹ *Spes* and *res* (future and present) are often contrasted (e. g. Cic. Att. 3. 22. 4); so also *spes* and *opes* (e. g. Cic. Cat. 3. 7).

² See note in Kiessling, ed. 3 (not ed. 4). Cf. Virgil, Aen. 6. 733, *Hinc metuunt cupiuntque, dolent gaudentque*. The context shows that these are the typical emotions of life.

³ Tib. II. 6. 20. Cf. Pichon, op. cit.: *Saepius sperare est confidere aut se amatum iri aut amantem rediturum, et ita spes timori frequenter opponitur*.

⁴ E. g. Tib. I. 6. 58 *tua mater me movet atque iras aurea vincit anus*; Prop. I. 18. 14; cf. Pichon, op. cit.

The jesting close, in which Horace humbles himself to the station of a pig, is intended to leave Tibullus in a more cheerful mood, and especially to bring Horace himself down to or below the level at which Tibullus imagines himself to be—Tibullus always modest and retiring, and now especially lowly in spirit. It should be noted that at the beginning Horace ingratiates himself by putting himself on a level with Tibullus, and by a jest, and that after his serious words are done he finishes in the same manner. We may imagine for ourselves the pathetic smile on Tibullus' lips. The poem is wonderfully sympathetic and shows Horace at his best. Perhaps we may now say that it is the most charming Epistle of them all.

As has been said, it may have been written as late as 20 B. C.; since Tibullus died in 19, or very soon after, it may well be that the melancholia ended in death.

II. THE ALBIUS OF HORACE, SERM. I. 4.¹

It is generally assumed that the diminution of Tibullus' property of which he complains in the first elegy was due to confiscation during or after the Civil Wars. Cartault (Tibulle, 1909, p. 8) makes the suggestion, only to reject it, that Tibullus' father squandered the estate. But this theory deserves some consideration. In Serm. I. 4. 28 Horace mentions an Albius who has a craze for bronze-collecting (*stupet Albius aere*), and again in verse 109 of the same Satire, in giving an example of his own father's method of teaching morals,—quoting him thus: *Nonne vides Albi ut male vivat filius utque Baius inops? Magnum documentum ne patriam rem perdere quis velit.* It is not at all likely that Horace means to be taken literally in this passage, and that those who are mentioned are actually the ones pointed out by his father. They are rather Horace's own stock of examples, taken from real life.² It is likely, however, that Albius was dead

¹ See above, p. 151.

² It is usually assumed that the father Albius in verse 109 is the same as the bronze collector in verse 28, but it is suggested in Kiessling-Heinze (ed. 4. 1910) that *Albi filius* is the collector and that the phrase *Albi filius* is used because Horace's father would be more familiar with the older man. This is untenable, not only because the same ought to be true of the other men mentioned in the passage, but because Horace would scarcely speak of Albius' craze for bronzes in the same Satire in which he cites his own father as pointing out, ten or more years before, how the same Albius had squandered his money.

when the Satire was written (about 39 B. C.), judging from Horace's custom in satirizing (Serm. II. 1. 39. f.). It seems to me quite probable that this Albius was the father of Tibullus, and that Tibullus was the *Albi filius* who "male vivat" (in a material sense, on account of his father's extravagance). This would fit in well with the probable date of Tibullus' birth (see above, p. 154, and below, p. 164, n. 2), for he would have been about sixteen at the time of the Satire. Tibullus says not a word about his father, though he speaks of his mother and sister. It is altogether likely that the father died when Tibullus was very young. If this be true, it is barely possible that there is added point to Hor. Epist. I. 4. 6-7, the son being contrasted with the father (see above, p. 157). There would also be added significance and pathos, perhaps, in some of Tibullus' expressions: (I. 1. 38-41)—*ficilia—pocula de facili composuitque luto, non ego divitias patrum fructusque requiro.* (I. 10. 8) *faginus scyphus.* (I. 10. 17, 20) *e stipite—ligneus deus.* (II. 3. 47, 48) *mihi—Samiae—testae fictaque Cumana lubrica terra rota.* The fact that he had such a father and that he lost even him when he was a mere boy may partly account for his later melancholia.

III. HORACE, SERM. I. 10 AND THE CIRCLE OF MESSALLA.

In the tenth Satire of the first book Horace defends his Satires against the critics, and concludes with a list of the men whose approval he seeks. The arrangement of names in this list is a matter of interest, for it is by no means haphazard. We have here the three great literary patrons of the age, Maecenas, Pollio

The temporal inversion would be too striking. Morris (Satires) thinks that the bronze-collector could not be the father mentioned in verse 109 (he does not consider the possibility just refuted). If the two are identical, then the bronze craze of course resulted in poverty and the son was blameless, as Morris tacitly assumes when he says: "The point of the illustration would be spoiled if the father had wasted the property; *Albi filius* is the spendthrift son of a prosperous father, and so an excellent illustration of the conduct which Horace's prosperous father wished his own son to avoid." But Horace's father may mean that Horace should be careful of his inherited (*patriam*) estate lest his children should suffer. The use of the same name in the same poem for two entirely different individuals seems to me very unlikely. Besides, the use of *Albi filius* instead of the son's name would seem to indicate that it is the father who is to blame. The identification of the two Albii seems, therefore, to be less open to objection than any other hypothesis.

and Messalla, and the members of their circles.¹ Maecenas' circle, the most important and the one to which Horace belonged, is mentioned first. With Maecenas' name is linked that of his greatest protégé, Virgil. Plotius and Varius, as usual, are together; it is well known that they belonged to the circle of Maecenas.² Valgius' connections have been unknown, but it has been assumed that he belonged to the circle of Messalla.³ The reason for the assumption is weak: because he is mentioned by the author of the *Panegyricus Messallae* in *Tib. IV. 1. 180* as a suitable person to sing the praises of Messalla. Horace (*Carm. II. 9. 19*) tells Valgius to sing the praises of Augustus, and, as Schanz elsewhere says (p. 211), this means that Valgius' talent for epic poetry was recognized in the circle of Maecenas. Thus the evidence for Valgius' membership in the circle of Maecenas balances that in favor of the circle of Messalla, and the evidence of Horace's *Satire* should decide in favor of the former.⁴ Horace next mentions Octavius, who is generally agreed to be Octavius Musa, a compatriot and fellow-student of Virgil's; he is addressed very affectionately in two poems of the *Catalepton*, very probably written by Virgil.⁵ He may well have been a member of the circle of Maecenas. Of Fuscus we know only that he was a good friend of Horace. The brothers Visci are mentioned next; all we know of them is that one of them is mentioned twice more by Horace; in *Serm. I. 9. 22*, his name is coupled with that of Varius, and in *Serm. II. 8. 20*, he or his brother reclines next to Varius at a dinner party at which Maecenas is the chief guest. According to the *Scholia*, their father was a friend of Augustus. It certainly looks as if they belonged to the charmed circle of Maecenas.

¹ This arrangement is hinted at by Teuffel, but he omits details and substantiation: Teuffel-Schwabe (1890) and Teuffel-Kroll (1909), *Gesch. d. röm. Lit. sect. 219*. In Kiessling-Heinze (ed. 4), the men mentioned in verses 81-83 are recognized as members of the circle of Maecenas, but the rest are classed together as members of the higher aristocracy.

² Plotius, Varius and Virgil are mentioned together in *Serm. I. 5. 40*. Maecenas also appears in this *Satire* (the Journey to Brundisium).

³ Schanz, *II. 1* (1911), p. 22, n. 2.

⁴ Teuffel-Schwabe and Teuffel-Kroll, 241. 1, infer from this passage that Valgius was a member of the circle of Maecenas, but say nothing of those mentioned next.

⁵ The whole collection is coming more and more to be considered Virgilian. Cf. Schanz, *op. cit.*, p. 105; also Dewitt's review of Birt, *A. J. P.* 32 (1911), 448.

Then Horace separates the next name by a whole verse from the ones just mentioned: *Ambitione relegata te dicere possum*, and comes to Pollio, who was apparently a circle by himself at this time—seemingly a rather crusty critic who found so much fault with other persons' writings that he was largely left to patronize himself. Messalla is next. The language of the rest of the passage should be noted: "Messalla, along with (*cum*) your brother, and at the same time (*simul*) you, Bibulus and Servius, and, together with these (*simul his*), you fair-minded Furnius, (and) several others, scholars and friends whom I intentionally pass over". The use of *cum*, *simul*, and *simul his* shows that these names are to be taken together, i. e., we have here the chief members of the circle of Messalla in 35 B. C. Messalla's brother, Gellius Publicola, of course is a member. Bibulus was a stepson of Brutus, and as such was brought into close contact with Messalla, one of the men on whom Brutus depended most. Is it not also significant that Bibulus was pardoned by Augustus at the same time Messalla was?¹ Servius is generally thought to be Servius Sulpicius Rufus, a son (or, as some think, a grandson)² of the orator of the same name famous in Cicero's day. Now Servius II married a sister of Messalla, and their daughter was Sulpicia, the poetess whose charming elegies are found in the Corpus Tibullianum, and who became later a prominent member of the circle of Messalla. In other words, the Servius of Horace is either the brother-in-law or nephew of Messalla, and is either the father or brother of Sulpicia. A further connection may exist in that Messalla's brother, just mentioned, was perhaps a pupil of Servius I.³ Next Horace mentions Furnius: Now Hieronymus (who excerpted Suetonius, *De Viris Illustribus*) says under the year 36 B. C.: *Furnii pater et filius clari oratores habentur: quorum filius consularis ante patrem moritur*. There seems to be no particular point in mentioning these men for the year 36 (for the son did not die that year). But it should be noticed that one of the consuls for the year was Messalla's brother, Gellius Publicola. It may be that Suetonius spoke of the Furnii in connection with Publicola. However, their mention may be due to the fact that in this year Sextus Pompey was defeated by a

¹ Appian, B. C. IV. 38.

² Schanz, p. 366.

³ If the corrupt reading Publicius Gellius in Pompon. dig. I. 2. 2. 44 is emended to Publicola Gellius, as Hotomann suggested (see Smith, *Dict. Biog.*, s. v. Gellius Publicius).

fleet sent by C. Furnius.¹ We know nothing more of interest for our purpose concerning Furnius. The *compluris alios* that Horace mentions next no doubt were also members of the coterie of Messalla, and thus it is all the more likely that Tibullus was one of them.²

Another interesting fact remains. Of those mentioned in the last group, Messalla, his brother and Bibulus had been in Athens together in the years before the battle of Philippi, and then had taken sides with Brutus, as Horace had. The same may have been true of Servius and Furnius. In the year 35, in which the Satire was probably written, Messalla, Furnius, Bibulus and probably Messalla's brother were closely identified with Mark Antony. The same may have been true of Servius. Thus it would seem that the circle of Messalla had its origin in the group of young men at Athens in the years just before Philippi; that this group joined Brutus' forces as a unit (Brutus was one of them); and that later, under Messalla's guidance, they joined Antony. This would naturally have been Horace's course as well, but for some reason or other he left the group (for he must have been a member) after the battle of Philippi, and entered that of Maecenas. He kept up, however, his friendship with the circle of Messalla, as indicated by this poem, and perhaps by his later friendship with Tibullus.

IV. CASSIUS PARMENSIS AND CASSIUS ETRUSCUS.

It seems to be the prevailing opinion at present that Cassius Parmensis (mentioned by Horace in Epist. I. 4. 3, and by other

¹ Some scholars, however, assign Hieronymus' statement to the year 37 B. C. (So Dessau, *Prosopographia imp. Rom.* vol. II).

² It was suggested above, p. 154, that Tibullus was too young to be mentioned by name. He was no doubt at least five, and probably eight to ten, years younger than those whose names are mentioned. Maecenas was born before 64; Virgil in 70; Varius probably earlier, at least not much later (he was a well-known poet in 41); Plotius apparently was of about the same age, at any rate not younger than Horace; Fuscus and Viscus were scarcely born later than 60, both being good friends of Horace before 35 (they are mentioned in Serm. I. 9, and, furthermore, Viscus' name is there coupled with that of Varius); Pollio was born in 76; Messalla not later than 64; Messalla's brother was older than he (for he was consul in 36); Bibulus was about as old as Horace (he went to Athens in 45); Furnius was a famous orator as early as 37 or 36. Tibullus was probably born in 55-54. See above p. 154, 161.

writers) is not the same man as the Cassius Etruscus spoken of in Hor. Serm. I. 10. 61, and only there. But I am inclined to go back to the older view. In the first place, the Scholiasts (including Porphyrio) identify the two, though, of course, that is no proof in itself. It has been argued¹ that Parma is not in Etruria, but in Cisalpine Gaul. Two answers can be made to this point. Etruscus may be a *cognomen*, not a designation of birth-place, and, in accordance with common custom, the *cognomen* precedes the *nomen* when the *praenomen* is omitted (cf. Carm. II. 2. 3; II. 11. 2; Epist. I. 2. 1; I. 8. 1). In the second place, Parma was very close to the border of Etruria, in fact the Etruscans had once been in possession of parts of Cisalpine Gaul. Parma was about as near the Etruscan border as Venusia was the Lucanian, so that if Horace was in doubt about the province to which his native Venusia belonged (Serm. II. 1. 34, *Lucanus an Apulus anceps*) he might be still more so about a town of northern Italy. Cassius, furthermore, may well have been an Etruscan Parmesan.

It is urged too that according to Serm. I. 10 (written about 35 B. C.) Cassius Etruscus had long been dead, and that we know from good sources that Cassius Parmensis lived until after the battle of Actium. Let us admit the latter, but examine the Horatian passage to see if another explanation can not be found. Cassius Parmensis had been a partisan of Brutus and Cassius, and, after Philippi, joined Sextus Pompey, who kept Octavian worried for some time, especially from 38 to 36 B. C. Pompey was defeated off Sicily in September 36, on which occasion many of his ships were burned (Appian B. C. V. 121). He himself escaped with a few ships to Asia Minor, and Cassius Parmensis went with him (for according to Appian B. C. V. 139, Cassius was among those who deserted to Antony there). One of Antony's generals, Titius, started against Pompey with a large fleet, and Furnius, Antony's legate, advanced with a land force. In desperation Pompey burned his own ships and joined his naval force to his land troops (35 B. C.). Now it may well have been rumored at Rome, either in 36 or 35 B. C. (especially the latter), that Cassius Parmensis was burned up with his ships. A garbled account of the events of the year 35 may have reached Rome, in which simply the burning of the ships (presumably by Pompey's opponents) and

¹ Weichert, De L. Varii et Cassii Parmensis Vita, 1836, p. 220.

the "loss" (really desertion) of Cassius Parmensis and others was mentioned. One should note Horace's words: *fama est*, "it is rumored", and should remember that the Satire was written very near the time of these events. *Fama est esse ambustum* may just as well mean "it is rumored that he *has been* burned" as "it is rumored that he *was* burned". It is no accident, perhaps, that Furnius is mentioned in the same Satire (in verse 86) as Cassius. He belongs there as a member of the circle of Messalla, as we have seen (p. 163), but, besides that, it was he, or perhaps his father, who had been partly responsible for the final downfall of Pompey and his army in Asia Minor. In the same way Horace may have been influenced to mention Cassius by the fact that he was a political enemy of Augustus as well as a literary opponent of his own.

There is possible, furthermore, another explanation of Horace's words. The interpretation of the Scholiasts that *ambustum* is used for *combustum*, and that Cassius' books served for his funeral pyre, seems to me very doubtful. *Ambustus* properly means scorched,—the meaning it has in the only other passage in which it is used by Horace (*Ambustus Phaethon*, Carm. IV. 11. 25). Some story about Cassius' escape from a fire in his house after trying to rescue some of his writings may be hinted at, or else it may have been spread about as a joke (*fama est*) that Cassius wrote so much that he used his books for lighting his fire.

At any rate there is nothing in the passage which cannot be easily explained to harmonize with what we know of Cassius Parmensis. Horace is contrasting his own slow and careful work with the rapid and careless output of Cassius. It is probably the same characteristic of Cassius that Horace satirizes by implication in Epist. I. 4. He uses *opuscula* playfully, by contrast,—he means huge, ponderous volumes—and the feat of "beating" (*vincat*) these would seem to be a great one. But why should Cassius Parmensis be singled out seven or more years after his death,—if Horace is making fun of him? This objection has been made by Weichert (p. 267). When Horace says *Candide iudex* (v. 1), he recalls the time when Tibullus gave his approval to the Satires,—the approval which Horace sought of him (as we saw above) and of others in Serm. I. 10. Approval for what? For the polish and carefulness of his work, as contrasted with the facile volubility of Lucilius and his latterday successors—of whom Cas-

sus was one.¹ The whole Satire centers largely around that point (*Saepe stilum vertas*, etc.). Cassius Etruscus (=Parmensis) is contrasted with Horace, Virgil, Tibullus and others. What more natural than that Horace should later remind Tibullus thus delicately of the time when the latter had sided with him against Cassius and others of his ilk? There is a point, then, in the mention of Cassius Parmensis which would not exist if he were not the same as Cassius Etruscus. It is significant that Cassius and Tibullus both are mentioned, directly or by implication, in both the Satire and the Epistle.

B. L. ULLMAN.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH.

¹ Very interesting, as showing the similarity between Horace and Tibullus in this respect, are the words of Quintilian (Inst. X. i. 93-94). He describes Tibullus merely by the words *tersus atque elegans* (trim and choice; one must be *elegans*—choose his words carefully—to be *tersus*). Horace in his Satires is called *tersior ac purus magis* (than Lucilius); *purus*, chosen to contrast with *lutulentus* applied to Lucilius, conveys the same idea as *elegans*. See also the valuable article of Bürger, *Beiträge zur Elegancia Tibulls*, in Leo, *Χάρτες* (1911) p. 393. For Tibullus' debt to Horace's Satires, cf. Jacoby in Rhein. Mus., 64, 65 (1909-10). Neither the Odes nor the Epodes show the same characteristics; that is one reason why they are not mentioned in Epist. I. 4. See also above, p. 154, n. 1.